



Academic Institution and The Community

Donald Cullington

Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences,
Lakehead University

DOI: 11.1517/mlt.2018.988

Abstract

To date, there has been little scholarly discussion or analysis of the various elements of these initiatives that contribute to successful community-campus partnerships. In an effort to better understand where these features may align or diverge, we reviewed a sample of community-campus brokering initiatives across North America, Canada and the United Kingdom to identify their different roles and activities. From this review, we developed a framework to delineate characteristics of different brokering initiatives to better understand their contribution to successful partnerships. The framework is divided into two parts. The first part examines the different structural allegiances of the brokering initiative by identifying the affiliation and principle purpose, and who received the primary benefits. The second part considers the dimensions of brokering activities in respect of their level of engagement, platforms used, scale of activity, and area of focus. The intention of the community-campus engagement brokering framework is to provide an analytical tool for academics and community-based practitioners engaged in teaching and research partnerships. The categories describing the different structures and dimensions of the brokering initiative will encourage participants to think through the overall goals and objectives of the partnership and adapt the initiative accordingly.

Keywords: *brokering initiatives; community-based research; community-campus engagement; partnerships; service learning*

Introduction

Academic institutions and community-based organizations have increasingly recognized the value of working together to meet their different objectives and address common societal needs. Building effective research and teaching collaborations between communities (e.g. organizations in the private, public and non-profit sectors) and academics (e.g. postsecondary students, postdoctoral fellows, instructors, professors and their institutions) have resulted in many fruitful outcomes (Buys & Bursnall 2007; Hart, Maddison & Wolff 2007). Schwartz et al. (2016, p. 178) explain that community-campus partnerships can provide ‘an avenue to address challenges that face society in new and innovative ways by bringing together knowledge, tools, and skills not previously combined’. Examples exist across a range of sectors and issue areas including community food security (Andrée et al. 2014; Andrée et al. 2016), poverty reduction (Calderón 2007; Schwartz et al. 2016), violence against women (Bell et al. 2004; Jaffe, Berman & MacQuarrie 2011), and community environmental sustainability (Baker 2006; Molnar et al. 2010), to name only a few. While a diversity of approaches exists, in ideal conditions of community-campus

engagement (CCE), partners share decision-making and equalise power throughout the research process (Lindamer et al. 2009), co-develop mutually beneficial outputs and outcomes (Levkoe et al. 2016; Naqshbandi et al. 2011), build capacity for under-resourced community-based organizations (Baquet 2012; Sandy & Holland 2006), engage new perspectives to increase knowledge (McNall et al. 2009), and sustain an ability to work together beyond the life of a specific project (Naqshbandi et al. 2011).

Despite the many successes, community-based practitioners involved in CCE have faced a number of challenges. While community groups typically enter into research relationships being promised mutually beneficial outcomes, studies show that academics and their institutions often benefit far more from these kinds of partnerships (Alcantara et al. 2015; Bortolin 2011; Cronley, Madden & Davis 2015). For community partners, barriers to participating in CCE can include limited time and resources to fully engage (Keyte 2014; Lantz et al. 2001), minimal support for building and maintaining partnerships (Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen 2011; Petri 2015; Sandy & Holland 2006), power imbalances (Schwartz et al. 2016), lack of trust (Lantz

et al. 2001; Petri 2015) and high levels of staff and volunteer turnover (Keyte 2014; Schwartz et al. 2016; Van Devanter et al. 2011). Despite recognition of these challenges, institutional structures are typically designed to support academics (Cronley, Madden & Davis 2015; Dempsey 2010; Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2000). Studies have also identified significant barriers faced by academics when participating in CCE, including having limited time and resources and being discouraged from community-engaged pedagogies through tenure and promotion structures (Levkoe, Brial & Danier 2014). While most responses tend to occur on a case-by-case basis, some have called for more institutionalised and sustained support mechanisms (Chen 2013; Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen, 2011).

CCE brokers have emerged as one response to these challenges. In this article, we broadly describe brokering initiatives as coordinating mechanisms that act as intermediaries between community-based organisations and academic institutions with an aim to develop collaborative and sustainable partnerships. A broker is an individual or organisation that helps connect and support relationships and share knowledge. While many different forms of brokering initiatives have emerged, there has been little synthesis or analysis on the various features of these initiatives that contribute to successful partnerships. Most brokering initiatives share a com-

mon goal of fostering relationships between community and campus partners; yet, they tend to be heterogeneous in their motivations, mandates, organisational structures, target groups, activities, and the sectors they serve. Because brokering initiatives differ on so many dimensions, it is necessary to consider their similarities and differences and assess which elements may be valuable for a particular type of CCE.

In this article, we present a framework for comparative analysis that identifies the different features, roles and activities of CCE brokering initiatives. This framework provides an analytical tool for academics and community-based practitioners to reflect on how the different characteristics of brokering initiatives may contribute to successful CCE partnerships. We begin by summarising the relevant literature, describing key features of CCE brokers, their different functions, and the various factors for success and challenges they face.

Describing and differentiating CCE brokering initiatives.

Brokering initiatives aim to support participants at different stages of a partnership and vary depending on their structures, targeted populations and specific activities. Experiences of CCE tend to be context-specific and a CCE broker's role is dependent on the specific project and the needs and assets of each partner. Brokering initiatives must also be flexible

and open to change depending on the phase of the relationship. Tennyson (2005) identified three key differences, which provide a basis for understanding how brokering initiatives e working with-in one of the partnering organisations and taking responsibility for preparing and conditioning the different actors, representing the organisation for the duration of the partnership, and managing various aspects of the collaboration. Internal brokers bring together relevant partners but may also share in decision-making throughout a project. These functions can be compared to those of external brokers who may be contracted by the partners to set up agreements, build capacity, and/or maintain and track ongoing effectiveness. External brokers support partners and equip them with tools to ensure the project is moving forward, but tend to take on little, if any, decision-making responsibility. Second, a broker can be an individual or a team working within or outside one of the partner organisations and tasked with building relationships on behalf of the organisation. Third, proactive brokers initiate and build partnerships, while reactive brokers coordinate partnerships or implement decisions on an organisation's behalf. While some CCE brokers play a key role in developing a partnership, others support a partnership after its initiation. The three differences identified by Tennyson demonstrate that brokers can take on

many roles, depending on the particular partners' needs.

Besides recognising the many differences, Tennyson and Baksi (2016) point to a series of common roles and activities among brokers. These include supporting partners throughout the phases in the partnership cycle from scoping and building (e.g. providing outreach and opportunities to engage, managing expectations), managing and maintaining (e.g. facilitating dialogue and governance arrangements, problem-solving), reviewing and revising (e.g. establishing and implementing an ongoing evaluation plan, supporting changes to the partnership) to sustaining outcomes (e.g. knowledge mobilisation, celebrating achievements, managing closure/next steps). Given the variation in the needs of partners and partnership phases, brokers are likely to take on many roles within and across projects, developing a suite of skills to support and benefit partnerships. While some brokering initiatives take on a single role across community-campus partnerships, such as making an initial connection between two partners, others assume a combination of roles, supporting partners throughout the life of a project.

Specific to community-campus projects, CCE brokers act as an intermediary between community-based organisations and academic institutions. They have been shown to support community and academic partners in designing and im-

plementing a project, establishing initial connections, delivering skills training, problem-solving, supervising students' community-engaged research and learning activities, evaluating a project's impact, and using results to improve future programs while contributing to positive changes in communities (Keating & Sjoquist 2000; Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015; Tennyson 2014). CCE brokers have also promoted learnings and insights, and addressed concerns of power and resource imbalance by ensuring community and campus partners share control equitably (Keating & Sjoquist 2000; Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015). In addition, because community organisations and universities face high levels of personnel turnover, CCE brokers can help by sustaining a project over the long term (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). To avoid leaving community-based organisations with unfinished projects, CCE brokers can help overcome constraints of an academic schedule by continuing to complete tasks after the end of a term.

In particular, brokering initiatives can be an accessible and responsive point of contact (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). For example, community-based organisations have expressed interest in having platforms to share research needs and interests, connect with academics and learn about opportunities for professional development (Dorow, Stack-Cutler &

Varnhagen 2011; Tryon & Stoecker 2008). Brokering initiatives use physical platforms that include providing accessible office space and community workspaces, and staging events that bring partners and other stakeholders together. They also use virtual platforms such as websites, forums and matchmaking databases to bring diverse partners together to share ideas and information, especially when they are not in the same place. Lacking, however, is an understanding of how these different activities meet partners' needs and the opportunities and limitations faced by CCE brokers when developing collaborations.

Factors for success and challenges of brokering initiatives.

In this section, we draw on the existing scholarly literature to highlight factors for success and challenges in initiating and maintaining brokering initiatives and CCE partnerships.

Factors for Success

During the early stages of developing a brokering initiative, significant planning and investment is required (Tryon & Ross 2012). To improve the chances for success when setting up a brokering initiative, Pauzé and Level 8 Leadership Institute (2013) stressed the importance of first identifying the goals of the brokering initiative and then selecting a governance structure accordingly. Further, studies have found that brokering initiatives can

benefit from having more formalised administrative infrastructure (Keating & Sjoquist 2000), a clear definition of their relationship with partnerships (Tennyson 2005), established guidelines and tools to address partners' needs (Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015) and flexibility in providing long-term support (Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen 2011).

CCE brokers must also give significant attention to planning before brokering partnerships and initiating projects. For example, brokers at the Institute for Sustainable Solutions at Portland State University developed a strategy screen to map out potential impacts and the resources required by partners to help them decide on appropriate CCE projects. Accordingly, an ideal project should have a high impact while requiring low resources from community partners (Holliday, DeFalco & Sherman 2015). By considering the purpose of the brokering initiative and the capacity of the community-based organisation, CCE brokers can assess existing capacity (e.g. time, human resources, funds) to identify ways they can best support the partners as a project progresses (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). This is especially important, considering that both academic and community partners tend to lack sufficient time and resources for CCE.

Brokering initiatives can help academics share knowledge and research skills with community partners and address

perceptions of CCE's uneven benefits (Keating & Sjoquist 2000; Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2000). To address issues of limited community capacity and trust, brokering initiatives can develop funding agreements to more equitably share financial resources, an activity complicated by most academic funding structures (Lantz et al. 2001; Naqshbandi et al. 2011; Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015). Building trust, however, takes time and commitment, and is a long-term process. Indeed, Evans and McClinton-Brown (2016), brokers from the Stanford University Office of Community Health, attempted to build on their many years of community-based work and their pre-existing relationships in an attempt to establish a community advisory board to support CCE efforts. Yet, they found that, in working out of the university, community members did not feel connected and many voiced feelings of alienation from the process. Through persistence and negotiation with the community advisory board members, an understanding was eventually established and the partnership was able to move forward. Likewise, in developing a pan-Canadian network of partners in First Nations communities, Naqshbandi et al. (2011) stressed the importance of valuing the different ways of knowing among the partners in order to be able to communicate in a manner that honoured and respected those involved (see Stiegman & Castleden 2015).

To achieve stability, CCE brokers benefit from identifying problems, developing strategies for overcoming challenges, putting plans in place, and providing ongoing evaluations (Naqshbandi et al. 2011). Brokering initiatives also require competent and consistent leadership to sustain themselves and the partnerships they support (Ivery 2010). As techniques and tools are refined, successful brokers are often able to empower and support the different partners without excessively controlling the partnership (Partnership Brokers Association 2012). In this way, they can play a management role, investing time and commitment but also being flexible as priorities develop and change (Lindamer et al. 2009). Tennyson (2005, p. 5) advised:

Good brokering is not a substitute for good partnering. It is always the partners themselves that are central to, and ultimately responsible for, making their partnership work. So a good broker works continuously to build capacity and systems within the partnership – thereby promoting healthy interdependence between the partners rather than partner dependence on the broker.

Maintaining and sustaining brokering activities involves evaluating the process and developing strategies for continued engagement (Burke 2013; Evans & McClinton-Brown 2016). To establish an evidence-based process for monitoring brokering initiatives, Phipps, Johnny and

Wedlock (2015) recommended tracking a broad range of outputs, including the number of opportunities for partnerships, the number of partnerships attempted, the number of partnerships developed, the reasons partnerships did not develop, and the impact of projects on partners. A utilisation-focused evaluation approach allows brokering initiatives to examine the partnership throughout the stages of the research process (Mundy 2013), which helps to identify successful partnership characteristics, key benefits, and challenges that can then be assessed (Hundal 2013; McNall et al. 2009). The Partnership Brokers Association (2016) recommends brokers use specific tools for self-assessment and professional reflection rather than reflecting generally on the partnership.

Challenges

There are several pitfalls that can affect the success of brokering initiatives. One common challenge occurs when CCE brokers fail to find the right balance between directing the partnership and letting the partners lead. If brokers hold too tightly to their own ideas, it can be detrimental to the partnership (Partnership Brokers Association 2012). Thus, it is important for CCE brokers to know when to step back (Evans & McClinton-Brown 2016).

Another common challenge for CCE brokers is having to navigate project partners' perceptions and assumptions of

research in general, and those of brokers in particular. For instance, while internal brokers may be well-informed and have experience working through organisational issues, partners may perceive them as biased in favour of their own organisation's way of operating and reluctant to accept new ideas. External brokers can be impartial to organisational politics, while partners may view them as being too distant and less committed when difficulties arise (Tennyson 2005). Because CCE brokers can be situated within or outside a partnership or community, they must proactively address partners' concerns.

Limited resources or a lack of core funding can also challenge the ability of a broker to provide useful services to sustain partnerships and projects (Naqshbandi et al. 2011). Without consistent funding sources, CCE brokers tend to devote significant effort towards grant writing (Baquet 2012; Keating & Sjoquist 2000). Keating and Sjoquist (2000, pp. 155–156) found that, in some instances, 'the choice of projects that are undertaken is largely determined by whatever kinds of projects are popular with funding agencies. The needs of communities can be overlooked if they do not require the kinds of projects that funding agencies are willing to underwrite.' The reluctance of academic and community participants to participate in time-consuming projects that do not yield outputs that are directly beneficial (e.g. publications, fund-

ing, policy change) can challenge CCE brokers. When project partners feel overburdened by excessive meetings, participation and enthusiasm within community advisory committees has been found to decrease (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). Of note, just as community and academic partners interested in CCE struggle to find sufficient resources, brokers too are not immune to these challenges.

Despite the valuable insights generated in the literature thus far, limited documentation exists about the specific role CCE brokers play and ways they can establish and maintain more mutually beneficial partnerships. In response, we present an analytical framework to articulate the potential contributions of brokering initiatives to community-campus partnerships. We reflect on learnings from our review, highlight the opportunities and limitations of our analytical framework, and provide suggestions for future research and practice.

A review of community-campus brokering initiatives.

The purpose of this review was to examine a sample of brokering initiatives, evaluate the commonalities and differences, and gain a better understanding of their contributions to successful community-campus partnerships. The initial research for this article was completed as part of the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement Research partnership (CFICE; see <https://carleton.ca/>).

We began by compiling a list of brokering initiatives through online searches of community organisations and academic institutions. Search terms included 'broker' and 'brokerage' by themselves and each combined with 'partnership', 'community-university partnership', 'community-campus partnership', 'community-based research', 'community-engaged research', and 'community-driven'. From our search, we selected brokering initiatives that fell within our broad definition presented in the introduction to this article. We shared an initial list with a number of academics and community-based practitioners involved in CCE work to ensure accuracy and identify additional brokering initiatives we may have missed. From our review, we selected a sample of 23 different brokering initiatives within Canada, the US and the UK. While the brokering initiatives we reviewed varied significantly, the key criterion for inclusion in this study was that each brokering initiative's mandate was to initiate and/or maintain partnerships between community and academic partners for the purpose of community-engaged teaching and research. For each initiative, we developed a profile, which included information gathered from websites and in some cases informal discussions with staff to obtain detailed descriptions of their work. Using cross-case analysis (Patton 2015), we categorised the information about each brokering initiative

and established a classification system. After analysing the 23 brokering initiatives, we discontinued our search for new examples because we were no longer finding new information or codes to add to the dataset (Fusch & Ness 2015).

A framework for analysis

The brokering initiatives we reviewed revealed a range of services, focusing on a variety of partners and thematic areas. In considering the commonalities and differences, we identified variation in two key areas. First, from examining the different attributes by identifying affiliation, principle purpose and who received the primary benefit, and comparing this information, we generated five separate categories that delineate the basic structural allegiance of each brokering initiative: (1) community-based, (2) university-based, (3) community-university-based, (4) resource-based, and (5) brokering networks. Second, we classified brokering initiatives into four key dimensions that consider the kinds of activities being undertaken. These categories include (1) level of engagement, (2) type of platform, (3) scale of activities, and (4) area of focus. We then describe the categories within the analytical framework in which to situate different brokering initiatives. Following this description, we highlight ways this framework might be used to help inform decisions about the establishment, development and long-term

sustainability of brokering initiatives their work, together with examples of the different brokering initiatives we reviewed.

Community-based brokering initiatives are rooted in communities and their primary purpose is to provide opportunities for community organisations to collaborate with academics and/or professional researchers on projects that address community objectives. The initiatives we reviewed worked with individuals and organisations in the public, private and/or non-profit sectors to accomplish a range of tasks, such as defining research questions and developing proposals, making initial connections with potential academics and other research partners, managing community-driven research projects, and providing training and mentoring in community-based research for all participants involved. Brokers pay particular attention to each community's needs and work to ensure the community's priorities drive the project. Brokers work with partners to make sure knowledge is co-created and projects are action-oriented, meaning that partners can use findings to make positive changes within their communities. Brokers build the capacity of community partners and community members by collaboratively developing training opportunities and resources. Stakeholders often include staff members and volunteers from community-based organisations, community residents, mar-

ginalised groups, academic institutions and government ministries.

One example of a community-based brokering initiative is the Centre for Community Based Research (community.ca/).

Located in Waterloo, Canada, it is an independent non-profit organisation which aims to promote collaborative approaches to the co-production of knowledge and innovative solutions to community needs. The Centre is committed to social justice and employs community researchers with insider perspectives. It uses a participatory and action-oriented approach, bringing people together with diverse expertise to contribute to positive community change. A second example is Vibrant Communities Canada (<http://www.vibrantcanada.ca/>) which engages a pan-Canadian audience to connect people, organisations, businesses and government to reduce poverty in Canada. Their efforts are community-driven and focus on supporting solutions to reducing poverty. Members connect through in-person events and online opportunities, including joining discussion groups or learning communities, contributing blog posts and searching member profiles.

University-based brokering initiatives typically aim to encourage the university population to engage in CCE through training, partnership matching, funding and ongoing support. These kinds of models may support initiatives

such as science shops, service-learning courses, community-based research projects and community outreach services. Many of them also offer support for community-based organisations working with academics by providing a range of services such as facilitating initial connections and partnership development, and offering templates for partnership agreements, financial and human resources and troubleshooting on an ongoing basis. Academic institutions typically house and fund university-based brokers to meet institutional needs. While community partners play an important role in projects working with academic faculty or students, a key purpose of these brokering initiatives is to ensure academics have opportunities to conduct research and learn within community organizations.

The Community Engaged Scholarship Institute (www.cesinstitute.ca/) is one example of a university-based brokering initiative. It is located in Guelph, Canada, and acts as a hub for engaged scholarship within the University of Guelph and the broader community. Staff members work with faculty members and students, community-based organizations and government, building capacity for participation in community engagement and social innovation projects. The Institute leverages resources, builds and maintains partnerships, and addresses obstacles to participating in community-engaged research. Another example is University-

Community Partnerships. Located in East Lansing, US, it provides a range of services for developing research networks among campus partners at Michigan State University and community partners. Staff match university partners interested in working with a community group or partner on a grant proposal or maintaining a long-term campus partnership with a community group. University-Community Partnerships balances university and community needs and priorities, promoting projects that provide mutual benefits for all partners, build capacity in communities and encourage long-term partnerships within research networks.

As a hybrid of the previous two categories, community-university-based brokering initiatives are often managed by a team of academic staff, students and/or faculty, as well as community-based organizational representatives. Initiatives in this category are typically driven by both community and academic partners, although it is common to see explicit reference towards prioritizing community objectives and goals. These types of brokering initiatives typically operate using a mix of resources from postsecondary institutions and external grant funding.

An example of a community-university based brokering initiative is the Helpdesk of the Community University Partnership housed at the University of Brighton in the UK. The Helpdesk's

work is community-driven and collaborative, with an emphasis on ensuring that community and academic partners are able to build equitable relationships and gain mutual benefit (Rodriguez & Millican 2007). It acts as a gateway to the university for both representatives from community-based organisations enquiring about funding for starting up a research project and faculty members who might have relevant research interest in collaborating on a project; and as a contact point for university staff and students interested in making contact with community-based organizations for collaborative research and teaching purposes. Initiated through philanthropic seed funding, the Helpdesk currently receives the majority of its funding through its university host. Another example is the Trent Community Research Centre (www.trentcentre.ca/) located in Peterborough, Canada. The Centre is community-based, with project proposals prioritizing community needs coming from community-based organizations. Brokers match Trent University students seeking to engage in community-based projects as volunteers or to fulfil part of their course work with community partners to conduct community-based research projects. They ensure that community partners' priorities drive the project, as well as supporting the university students throughout the project.

Resource-based brokering initiatives include grant programs that provide resources to community-based organizations and academic researchers and/or institutions that aim to address key challenges through research and action. While some resource-based brokering initiatives simply provide monetary resources, others prefer to play a more active role in the partnership by taking on management responsibilities and/or offering extended support services such as training and knowledge mobilization services. For example, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/partnerships-partenariats/index-eng.aspx) offers a series of grant programs to support partnerships between academics at different universities, as well as between businesses and non-profit organizations. Funds are granted to carry out research, training and knowledge mobilization activities using approaches that involve partners collaborating and sharing leadership. Funds can be used to establish new partnerships, test partnership approaches and expand established partnerships. As a second example, the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement in Bristol, UK, supports universities throughout the UK to increase how often and how well they engage in community-based research and learning activities. It works with campus staff members and students to develop

skills for community-engagement activities and offers training sessions (e.g. funding, impact, evaluation) and consultancy to researchers, research managers and staff members in community-based organizations.

Finally, brokering networks, the broadest of the brokering initiative categories, describe initiatives that tend to operate independently to foster relationships through a series of mechanisms. With brokering networks taking on a range of formal and informal structures, they often require little commitment from members and minimal resources to sustain. Networks can also work across geographies to provide a channel for sharing information, resources and ideas (Ontario Health Communities Coalition n.d.). Brokering networks offer opportunities to develop partnerships, collaborate on projects and share information in a more indirect way than the other four structures.

The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (www.ccphealth.org/) is a membership-based CCE network that provides numerous opportunities to promote and connect communities and academic institutions around health equity and social justice (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 2017). Through their website, multiple listservs and biennial conference, the network mobilises knowledge, provides training and technical assistance, conducts research, builds coalitions and advocates for supportive

policies. As a brokering network, it unites community practitioners and academics from diverse fields around community-based participatory research principles and practices. On the other hand, the Canadian Rural Research Network (<http://rural-research-network.blogspot.ca/>) acts as a hub for rural stakeholders across Canada, including academics, practitioners, formal and informal community groups, and government officials, to share research outputs. Members can stay up-to-date on rural research, connect with various rural stakeholders, and develop and maintain research partnerships. The Network has no budget, but is sustained by its members who serve on various committees.

The second part of the framework Below we present a description of each of the four categories as well as examples of some of the different kinds of brokering initiatives.

First, level of engagement covers the frequency of support and duration of involvement that brokers have with stakeholders throughout a CCE project. The level of engagement of the different brokering initiatives can be conceived of as a continuum that meets the needs of CCE partnerships in a variety of ways. At one end are brokering initiatives that provide 'light-touch' engagement, which often involves CCE brokers having initial contact with partners, being less involved after the partnership has been established,

and allowing the partners to take on leadership. For example, some brokering initiatives we reviewed supported community-engaged learning projects by pairing students with community-based organizations to fulfill coursework requirements, identifying faculty members to work with a particular community partner, and offering training sessions, one-time learning events, or meeting spaces to be used on an as needed basis. At the other end are brokering initiatives that offer a deep level of engagement. This involves establishing partnerships and playing an active role throughout the duration of the project by working with partners to manage and conduct community-driven research. The Trent Community Research Centre, for example, maintains contact with partners throughout the course of a project and sometimes beyond. These CCE brokers also engage in project-planning and decision-making, helping to secure project funding, and in the case of community-based research activities, playing a direct role in the research (e.g. data collection, analysis and interpretation, and knowledge mobilization).

Second, brokering initiatives differed in respect of the types of platforms they used to manage services. Some brokering initiatives maintained a physical centre within an academic institution or an office in the community. Having a physical presence within a community or on campus allowed these types of brokering ini-

tiatives to host face-to-face meetings with community and university partners or make workspaces available for planning, data collection or informal discussions. Learning events, such as workshop series, presentation panels and informal meet-and-greets could also be used to bring community and academic partners together for face-to-face interaction. Other brokering initiatives, such as the Canadian Rural Research Network, used virtual platforms that offered community and academic partners the opportunity to connect through online communication tools, such as discussion forums, listservs, researcher wanted boards, expertise or member profile searches, volunteer or partner matching databases, and virtual platforms for group collaboration. Some brokering initiatives offered a combination of physical and virtual platforms as multiple ways to connect diverse partners.

Third, brokering initiatives differed in their scale of activities. Some brokering initiatives were primarily focused on supporting partnerships in their local community or region. Examples include brokering partnerships between community groups and students to establish a food rescue program in a city, establishing connections with local housing providers and professors to develop innovative opportunities in a low-income neighborhood, and working with local libraries to match university students with chil-

dren in need of reading mentors. Other brokering initiatives reached a national audience. For example, establishing partnerships between rural researchers and practitioners across Canada, connecting diverse stakeholders to explore national poverty solutions, and bringing together community-based organizations and academics in the UK over issues of food security. Other brokering initiatives spanned a much wider geography, working with partners on an international scale. Examples include promoting an exchange of ideas and knowledge-sharing at international health and social justice conferences on community-based participatory research, implementing an international in-person community-campus partnerships course and follow-up mentoring, and promoting online global dialogue and resource-sharing for students and community activists interested in social action and research.

Lastly, the areas of focus varied among the different brokering initiatives. Some initiatives engaged in particular issue-based activities and services. For example, a brokering initiative focusing on community food security hosted webinars and workshops, posted articles on their website and sent out newsletters to members. Other issue-based efforts covered poverty reduction, rural research, HIV/AIDS, and housing. In general, these activities tended to be more issue-based than those in the other brokering initia-

tive categories. Some brokering initiatives had a much broader focus, however, with CCE brokers engaging in projects using community-engaged approaches to teaching and research, focusing on a broad range of issues and areas, such as community resilience and health promotion.

Upon examination of the four categories, level of broker engagement and types of broker platforms, appeared to be the most informative for developing a brokering initiatives matrix. Areas of focus tended to vary among the brokering initiatives and few patterns could be identified from that dimension. And while we noticed that brokering initiatives using virtual platforms tended to reach more national and international audiences, whereas physical platforms lent themselves to a local scale of activity, descriptions of activities within the level of broker engagement and type of broker platforms seemed most informative for guiding brokering initiatives. provides a summary of these two brokering initiative dimensions.

Broker initiative dimensions matrix

Brokering initiatives in the virtual-light touch quadrant offer opportunities to share knowledge and establish connections with a wide span of members or partners. The Canadian Rural Research Network is one example of this type of approach. Some drawbacks to this approach include members engaging in pas-

sive interactions (e.g. scanning a blogpost), but not reaching out to members, and offering limited member contact by not promoting regular member or partner contact. Brokering initiatives in the virtual-deep engagement quadrant offer members more engaging opportunities to connect by promoting ongoing project sharing, regular meetings and frequent news updates. While this approach has great potential in deeply connecting diverse stakeholders, we did not come across this kind of brokering initiative in our search. Drawbacks to this approach could be the increased resources required within the brokering initiative to moderate discussions, host meetings, and provide regular coaching and member interaction. Brokering initiatives in the physical-light touch quadrant offer services to connect people within communities while requiring fewer resources to sustain a deep engagement initiative. The Helpdesk is an example of a brokering initiative that uses this approach. A drawback could be that partners might not be able to sustain engagement without a broker's ongoing support. Finally, the physical-deep engagement brokering initiative offers partners opportunities to deeply engage with one another throughout the life of a project. The Centre for Community-Based Research is an example of this type of brokering initiative. Drawbacks include the resources, such as

time, space and funds, necessary to support partners at each phase of a project.

Conclusions

In this article, we have presented an overview of the features, roles and activities of brokering initiatives and a framework to better understand their contributions to successful community-campus partnerships. Our intention has been to provide an analytical tool that can support academics and community-based practitioners engaged in teaching and research partnerships. There are a number of ways this framework might be used in developing new or existing brokering initiatives. First, the categories in each of the two parts of the framework describing the different structural allegiances (i.e. community-based brokering initiatives, university-based brokering initiatives, community-university-based brokering initiatives, resource-based brokering initiatives and brokering networks) and dimensions (i.e. levels of engagement, types of platforms, scales of activities and areas of focus) could encourage partners to think through their overall goals and objectives. The framework could also help participants to better evaluate the purpose of a brokering initiative and the various mechanisms to be used to meet those objectives. Further, it might enable consideration of the strengths and limitations of various brokering initiatives in order to understand what each might accomplish,

its limitations, and how it could adapt accordingly.

For example, a CCE broker interested in disseminating knowledge, keeping participants up-to-date on activities and providing a place for input and sharing ideas might adopt a virtual light-touch engagement model. This type of model would require few resources to maintain (e.g. staff members, infrastructure, costs). A brokering initiative interested in regularly engaging a wide reach of partners or members, but at a low cost, might wish to use a virtual deep-engagement model. This could keep overheads low as only a few key staff members would be required to maintain online communication tools and activities (e.g. website, discussion moderation, web coaching, webinars). By contrast, a brokering initiative seeking to have a wide community impact by reaching many diverse partners might decide to use a physical light-touch model. By offering matching services, but not requiring resources to provide ongoing support to partnerships throughout a project, this type of initiative would require minimal staff members to review proposals and match partners. The most resource-intensive choice is the physical deep-engagement model. A brokering initiative with the goal of establishing and maintaining CCE partnerships and supporting partners long-term would need to ensure they had adequate, ongoing funding available to sustain such a model. As

more CCE projects turn to brokering initiatives as a way to support their work, it is important that all partners have a clear sense of the initiative's purpose and what is involved.

The framework could also be used to consider where and how to situate a brokering initiative. For example, a brokering initiative based in the community would be more accessible for community-based organizations and more understanding and responsive to their needs than if based in a university. This would be especially true if there was concern that a particular institutional structure might not address the needs of community participants in a meaningful way. However, university-based brokers might have more success securing funding and other resources to support their work. Universities could also facilitate broader based partnership networks, while many non-profit organizations would have limited capacity to build and maintain relationships beyond those related to their immediate work. With university funding, however, comes additional expectations (e.g. prioritizing faculty and students, adhering to a university's strategic plan). As another example, as brokering initiatives in a physical location are typically housed in community-based centers or university-based offices, they are well positioned to respond to their immediate community, an important element in building trust. Network brokers, on the other hand, tend

to use virtual platforms, which limit face-to-face contact but allow them to reach a much wider constituency.

Brokering initiatives could also use this framework when mapping out the resources needed to sustain their work. Common to most brokering initiatives we examined was the importance of having a steady source of funding to develop infrastructure, hire staff to carry out the necessary tasks and sustain the initiative over the long-term. CCE brokers that are funded or based in a university tended to have the most stability and capacity as a result of solid institutional backing. In fact, some of the brokering initiatives we studied began as independent organizations based in the community, but over time chose to relocate to the university due to funding opportunities and the institutional resources and supports available. Having stable funding appeared to lessen the anxiety of participants and allow CCE brokers to focus on improving the content of their activities and services. In a number of cases, added stability also enabled participants to more seriously consider and address power imbalances within their relationships. Some of the networks we examined, such as the Canadian Rural Research Network, did not have funding and, as a result, operated primarily as a shell, with activities driven completely by participants (typically those with grants to do their work). The source of funding also made a significant

difference to the work CCE brokers could take on. For example, one brokering initiative reported that having support from an external funder over the course of several years allowed them to respond better to community needs, take risks and experiment with new types of activities rather than worrying about whether they were addressing the university's strategic plan. For many academics, a well-funded, secure and long-term partnership provided added legitimacy for engaging in, and in some cases leading, CCE projects.

We propose several directions for future research on CCE brokering initiatives. First, there is very little research documenting and evaluating case studies of brokering initiatives, especially in peer-reviewed journals. These kinds of scholarly studies are important as a means of sharing information and comparing and contrasting the efforts of different initiatives. The framework is a first step towards that in-depth analysis and could be used to further examine the process of building and maintaining CCE brokering relationships and models. Second, limited research exists on both the factors for success and the challenges faced by CCE brokering initiatives. To share learning, we suggest that researchers analyse experiences and document lessons learned from attempts at brokering community-campus partnerships in relation to the categories proposed in this article. Finally, CCE practitioners would benefit from

studies of the different tools available to support brokering initiatives. We propose that these tools could be conceptualized in relation to the framework.

While this framework provides a valuable tool for understanding and evaluating brokering initiatives, it is not intended to be static. In most cases, we found that the categories were not fixed and that many of the brokering initiatives we examined took on more than one of the structural allegiances and/or dimensions simultaneously. This speaks to the context in which many of these brokering initiatives operate (e.g. reacting/responding to changing funding realities, program priorities of community organisations, emerging/unanticipated needs, etc.). Also, as technology changes along with the needs of CCE, new tools are being developed that may require different kinds of

In response, the past 20 years have witnessed the emergence of participatory approaches that seek to reduce the distance between researchers and the 'subjects' of research by engaging directly with local stakeholders. Community-based research (CBR) is a relatively new methodology often aligned with critical theory and characterised by co-generation of knowledge and shared decision-making between researchers and community members. As such, CBR may challenge traditional ways of 'doing research'. Supporting CBR has increasingly become a strategic priority for universities due to

frameworks to understand and interpret CCE activities. Thus, while we compared brokering initiatives in order to understand their different attributes, we are not advocating a standardised approach to evaluation. Our research and experience leads us to suggest that brokering initiatives must be context-specific and respond to the needs of both community and academic partners. However, we need mechanisms to support community-campus partnerships in a more institutional and sustained way. It is our hope that the analytical framework will make a meaningful contribution to this endeavour. Specifically, we wish to acknowledge contributions made by Peter Andrée, Jason Garlough, Stephen Hill, John Marris, Natasha Pei, Amanda Sheedy, Elizabeth Whitmore and Amanda Wilson.

its potential to enhance research impact (Hall 2009 Speer & Christens 2013). As CBR is integrated into institutional frameworks and a growing number of researchers incorporate CBR into their research practice, it becomes increasingly important to understand CBR research principles and values.

However, the idea of CBR itself can be contestable. In this article, we use CBR as an umbrella term for research that involves community engagement. Other terms that may fall under this umbrella include action research, participatory action research, community-based partici-

patory research, community-based participatory action research, peer research, (community) engaged research, and inclusion research. In some fields, such as health sciences, it is important to distinguish between CBR, which indicates that research takes place in the community, as opposed to the laboratory, clinic or hospital, and community-based participatory research, in which the community plays an equitable role in every phase of the research (Blumenthal 2011).

However, to date there has been no systematic study of CBR values and principles guiding the research process or of how the application of CBR principles differs across academic researchers and community partners in various disciplines in one large university institution. Often, CBR values and principles are provided as a list of ethical considerations that are taken as given rather than negotiated by those directly involved in the research process. Moreover, the means by which particular principles or values are identified is not explained, or is done descriptively, usually by narrating research processes. Similarly, research has not yet explored the ways in which understandings of CBR's underlying values differ with respect to the faculty member's own research compared to the broader research values of a large university with many faculties and departments which may hold rigid ideas of what counts as 'real research'.

In order to address these gaps, our purpose for this study was to provide a forum for discussion of CBR values and principles (VPs) across disciplines for both faculty and community partners. In this article, we report the findings of a systematic cross-disciplinary survey of CBR researchers and community partners at a large Canadian research university. We also explore some common understandings of CBR's defining values and principles among different groups of stakeholders engaged in community-based research. Through the Delphi approach, this study generated a set of community-based research VPs. However, the findings also uncovered diverse and complex understandings among the respondents of the potentially 'political' nature of CBR. We highlight the complexity of defining VPs of CBR in one institution, given the issues of relationality and power reflected in the study.

Literature review

The major themes in the literature on CBR values and principles may be grouped under three broad, interconnected concerns: relationships, power and social change. Relationships refer to the multifaceted relations among community members engaging in research, the community organisations representing community members, university researchers and their institution. Power denotes access and control over resources, data and

decision-making as well as over the definition of legitimate academic knowledge production. Social change references the desire of many CBR researchers to better the living conditions of research participants or provide support and capacity-building for greater equity and justice. We explore these issues in more detail below.

Relationships

Most authors agree that the relationship between the researcher and the researched is central to CBR. Accountability, trust, reciprocity, respect, solidarity and collaboration are frequently mentioned in the literature; moreover, for CBR scholars, relationships are part of a process that is at least as important as scholarly outcomes such as publications (Brydon-Miller 2009; Elliott 2012; Israel 2008; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008). Several scholars suggest that CBR partners must commit to long-term research relationships and emphasise the iterative nature of the CBR process (CAMH 2011; Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer 2009). Drawing on Kirkness and Barnhardt's (2001) earlier work, Stanton (2014) proposes that CBR should adhere to the 'four Rs' of respect, relevance, reciprocity and responsibility. CBR researchers also stress the importance of open and inclusive processes and acknowledgement of one's social location (Brydon-Miller 2009; Cochran et al. 2008).

Stanton (2014) examines the potential for CBR to disrupt mainstream research paradigms that privilege 'individual merit', hierarchical prestige, methodological and discursive norms, and work that culminates in publication, to instead value the lived experiences of individuals and communities and ensure dissemination of knowledge gained to all partners. In this sense, CBR blurs the line between the researcher and the researched by recognising research participants as active 'subjects' rather than passive 'objects;' everyone is an expert (OWHN 2009). For example, St Denis (1992) argues that CBR is for and with rather than about or on research participants.

CBR's focus on relationships and accountability creates an affinity with Indigenous research methodologies. As in CBR, Indigenous researchers develop relationships in order to seek knowledge (Wilson 2008). Relationality in Indigenous research is not concerned so much with statistical significance or validity, but rather with accountability to relationships; this requires an unsettling of binaries such as knower/known and subject/object (Wilson 2008). Cautioning that, from the vantage point of the colonised, 'research' has been, and for the most part continues to be, a tool of imperialism and colonialism, Smith (2012) affirms 'research' to be one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world's vocabulary, and sets an agenda for research that takes seriously

Indigenous ways of knowing and being by posing a series of questions similar to those asked by CBR researchers. These include 'Whose research is it? Who owns it? Whose interests does it serve? Who will benefit from it? Who has designed its questions and framed its scope? Who will carry it out? Who will write it up? How will the results be disseminated?' (p. 10; see also Flicker, Roche & Guta 2010; Minkler 2004; OWHN 2009). In these contexts, CBR may go some way to addressing conflict between the Western values of the academic setting and those of marginalised and Indigenous communities (Cochran et al. 2008).

Power

In conventional research methodology, the 'objects' of research provide data which the researcher ('subject') analyses and owns. Conversely, many CBR scholars share the objective of creating equity in research relationships through attention to social inequities and shared ownership of the project, and findings for the benefit of all partners (Heffner, Zandee & Schwander 2003; Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer 2009; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008). Breaking down traditional understandings of research subjects and objects through partnerships based on shared ownership implies disrupting existing power relations. For example, Cochran et al. (2008) argue that conventional research has perpetuated a myth that Indigenous people represent a 'problem' to be exam-

ined and solved and that they are passive 'objects' requiring assistance from outside experts. CBR responds to the limitations of traditional research approaches by acknowledging different ways of knowing, valuing the voices of community residents and generating knowledge that meaningfully addresses locally identified problems (Fletcher 2003; Jacobson & Rugeley 2007).

Generating equity in relationships means CBR must challenge power explicitly (Elliott 2012; OWHN 2009). Accordingly, most writing on CBR begins with an assumption that CBR is more openly political (in the sense of naming and unsettling relationships of power) than conventional research aimed at objectivity. For example, Brydon-Miller and Maguire (2009, p. 79) suggest CBR is an 'unapologetically political approach to knowledge creation through and for action'. For many authors, ethics and empowerment are two key pillars of CBR (Blumenthal 2011; CAMH 2011; Elliott 2012; Israel et al. 2001; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008; Minkler 2004). Building on these ideas, some scholars insist on the importance of anti-oppression principles and an acknowledgement that research is not value free, arguing that claims to objectivity have been used to subordinate research participants (CAMH 2011; OWHN 2009; Savan et al. 2009; Schwartz & van de Sande 2011). CBR scholars assert that CBR is a response to conventional

research that has failed to protect or benefit participants and directly or indirectly led to significant harm (Wells & Jones 2009).

Because of CBR's explicit attention to power relations, some critics contend that CBR is unscientific, overly political and susceptible to bias, that community interests supersede theoretical and scientific rigour, and that it constitutes activism rather than research (Hernández 2015; McAleavey & Muir 2011; Ochocka and Janzen 2014). In other words, scholars have identified a perceived tension between the values of scientific rigour and those of community participation (Elliott 2012; Minkler 2004). However, advocates argue that CBR has greater potential for meeting the standards of scientific knowledge creation than conventional social science precisely because researchers are engaged directly in the transformation of the phenomena they study (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood & Maguire 2003). Similarly, feminists have long pointed to the value of acknowledging the situated nature of knowledge (Haraway 1988).

Social Change

Following from the focus on power relations, several authors suggest that a key principle of CBR involves the integration of knowledge and action for social change, with the objective of transforming fundamental structures that sustain inequalities in order to improve the lives of

those involved, as they define improvement (Brydon - Miller & Maguire 2009; CAMH 2011; Elliott 2012; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008; OWHN 2009; Stanton 2014). For Ross et al. (2010), social justice is a goal of CBR that includes ensuring research priorities respect the needs of marginalised communities and promote self-determination. Similarly, St Denis (1992) argues that CBR must be committed to critiquing the status quo and building a more just society.

As part of promoting positive social change, many authors stress the commitment of CBR researchers to capacity-building, co-learning, and expansion of critical consciousness (Brydon-Miller & Maguire 2009; CAMH 2011; Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer 2009; OWHN 2009; Stanton 2014; Stoudt, Fox & Fine 2012). For example, Freudenberg and Tsui (2014) argue that improvements in health equity requires addressing the social determinants of health; consequently, policy change becomes a public health goal. Power dynamics are woven throughout policy efforts to improve health, and the work of public health researchers is inherently political because it concerns power relations (Freudenberg & Tsui 2014).

In sum, the literature reveals CBR as an ethical research practice that calls for researchers to be reflexive throughout the research process, leading to social transformation. Although the literature speaks

to the values and principles of CBR, they have not been clearly articulated. To address this gap, we conducted a Delphi study among active CBR researchers at a research university in Western Canada.

Methodology

The university in which we conducted this study piloted a CBR initiative a few years ago. A steering committee under the Vice-President Research was set up to increase the visibility of CBR and promote the adoption of best practice at the university. Despite the fact that CBR is widely practised on campus, there has been a concern among CBR researchers that they are disadvantaged in research ethics reviews and tenure and promotion processes by the lack of understanding of the values and principles (VPs) of CBR. To address this concern, we conducted this study to generate a list of VPs that could be used as reference for these reviews and processes.

As a comprehensive research university with over 5000 research faculty members, CBR researchers come from a variety of disciplines, each of which has its own research tradition, stakeholders and understanding of CBR. It is therefore difficult to identify all CBR researchers. Besides, the very essence of CBR entails the participation of community partners; therefore, it was also important that we involve their voices in a study to explore the values and principles of CBR. The actual number and identification of all

community partners involved in CBR with this university was hard to determine. Thus, it was technically difficult to generate a frame for sampling via a traditional survey method.

Since broad generalisation was not our goal, we decided to employ the Delphi technique developed by the RAND Corporation in the 1950s (Dalkey 1967) to conduct this study. The Delphi method is a popular approach widely used in different fields to generate agreement through synthesis of a diverse range of expert opinions (Hasson, Keeney & McKenna 2000; Yan & Tsang 2005). As a research tool, Delphi depends on group dynamics rather than statistical authority to achieve consensus among experts (Okoli & Pawlowski 2004). It is a systematic, multiple-step process to solicit and collect information from respondents who are experts in a subject area. The design of a Delphi study is flexible and responsive to the actual data collection process. The number of rounds of data collection is contingent on the emergence of consensus which, although mainly based on majority view, is achieved without respondents feeling they are being judged (Geist 2010). Delphi also allows respondents to respond to emerging ideas during the research process in a time-effective manner (Tersine & Riggs 1976). In the absence of a face-to-face group discussion, respondents can express and exchange ideas

freely in a confidential and anonymous fashion (Okoli & Pawlowski 2004).

Respondents

Following the Delphi tradition, respondents in our study were presumed to be experts in community-based research. Prior to this study, the Steering Committee organized several events to promote CBR on campus. An email list of approximately 200 CBR research practitioners was compiled. Phone, email and in-person invitations to take part in the study were sent to all registered researchers. We also invited people on the list to refer to us other CBR researchers who might be interested in participating, and an email was sent to all university Deans with a request to forward the invitation to members of their faculties who may have been actively involved in CBR. We also invited researchers who confirmed their participation to recommend at least one of their community partners take part in this study. A total of 106 people, including 50 faculty researchers, 37 community partners and 19 staff, who are research staff supporting and working on CBR research projects conducted by faculty researchers, were finally confirmed. They were invited to participate in three rounds of data collection, which were to take place from April to July 2015. Generally, Delphi prefers a stable and small group of respondents throughout the process. However, as it was difficult to monitor this large group of respondents,

particularly when their participation was anonymous due to a requirement of the institutional ethics review protocol, ultimately only 70 of the 106 (66 per cent) confirmed participants took part in the first round of the survey. Attrition rate in Round 2 was 38.6 per cent and in Round 3, 48.6 per cent. Despite this, as noted in Table 1, there was a fair representation from faculty, community partners and staff in all three rounds. However, due to the small sample and the purpose of the study, we did not compare the answers from these three groups of respondents.

Procedures

The Delphi method is a stepwise process. The first step involved creating a draft list of values and principles. Based on an extensive literature review, which included records generated from previous CBR activities organised by the Steering Committee, 13 major categories (see Table 2) with a total of 150 itemised VPs were generated. The list was reviewed and discussed by a working group which had been set up to advise the Steering Committee on ethical issues related to CBR. Minor adjustments were made based on the discussion. In view of the diverse terminologies used by researchers from different disciplines across the campus, the working group also recommended not to provide an operational definition of CBR in order to allow respondents to describe their practice in an open-ended way. An online survey tool was em-

ployed in the three rounds of data collection.

Note: The number of items eliminated in the first round of the survey based on the cut-off point (discussed below) appears in brackets.

The aim of the first round of the survey was to refine a list of VPs for community-based research rooted in the experiences of the researchers and community members involved in the study. This list then formed the basis of subsequent rounds of Delphi. Respondents were asked to indicate whether each category, and its itemised values and principles, was significant for their CBR practice and therefore could remain on the list in subsequent rounds. A comment box was provided under each VP for additional comments. The final question asked respondents to describe their CBR practice. Forty-three respondents provided a total of 252 comments in the first section, and 52 respondents provided descriptions of their CBR practice.

Delphi generates consensus largely and arbitrarily based on a majority rule. However, determining a reasonable cut-off point for sufficient consensus can be controversial (Yan & Tsang 2005). According to the literature, the minimum cut-off is 51 per cent, and some Delphi studies employ up to 80 per cent. Following completion of Round 1, a workshop was held to discuss the desirable cut-off point. All survey participants were invit-

ed. Twelve people attended the workshop (five faculty members, three staff, three community partners and the project RA). Following previous Delphi studies reported in the literature, attendees at the workshop decided to adopt a two-third majority rule, i.e. 67 per cent, as the cut-off point; the same figure was used for the Round 2 and 3 surveys. Although the 67 per cent cut-off was in fact arbitrary, it was considered by workshop attendees to represent a reasonable figure that was neither too restrictive nor too open. In Round 1, respondents were asked to select items from the provided list of VPs. VPs chosen by two-thirds or more of respondents were included. In Rounds 2 and 3, the Delphi survey questions were about importance and relevance as they perceived them. Answers were arranged on a Likert scale from 1 (least) to 5 (most). Only VP items for which two-thirds or more of respondents checked '4' or '5' were retained. As a result, the total number of itemised VPs was reduced to 88 from 150. Workshop attendees and the study researchers also discussed rewording some VP categories and itemised values and principles, for example, 'Participation' became 'Equitable participation'. Further, since only one itemised principle under 'Transformation of fundamental structures' passed the cut-off, it was decided that we would eliminate this category and move the remaining item to the

category of 'Long-term relationship', where it was more appropriately located.

The Round 2 survey had two parts. In the first part, the central question concerned the relevance of the remaining itemised VPs in each category. Specifically, we asked, 'On a scale of 1–5 (with 5 being "most relevant") how relevant is this itemized VP to: a) your CBR practice? b) the university?' Each section included a space for respondents to share additional comments. Part 2 was an optional question that asked whether any of the VPs or refined meanings that had fallen below the 67 per cent cut-off in Round 1 were crucial to respondents' research.

Round 3 focused on the importance of the 12 remaining VP categories. Respondents were asked, 'On a scale of 1–5 (with 5 being "most important") how important is this VP to a) your CBR practice? b) the university?' Each section included a comment box for respondents to share additional comments. Since the intention of this round of the survey was to prioritise these 12 categories based on their importance, no cut-off point was used. Instead, totals were derived from the sum of the percentage of respondents who indicated the importance to be either four or five.

At the end of the Round 3 survey, we provided an opportunity for respondents to share their thoughts on possible uses of the results from this study as well as any other comments they wished to share.

Twenty people provided a total of 23 comments.

Limitations

This study has its limitations. It was hard to provide a universally accepted definition of such a heavily laden term as CBR. By not providing an operational definition, we were able to include diverse opinions, but the respondents might have answered the questions from different or even contradictory perspectives. Due to the nature of the research design, we were not able to compare these diverse perspectives in the answers of the three major stakeholder groups. Further, the Delphi method is meant to solicit opinions from a group of experts through a methodologically 'neutral' medium, a survey in this case. However, the 'majority rule' in determining criteria unexpectedly raised some of the same political challenges that many CBR researchers have already experienced with regard to their CBR practice vis-a-vis the university and their departmental colleagues, in that some respondents found some of the VPs most important to them were not held in the same regard by other respondents and therefore not included in the final list.

Findings

Throughout the Delphi exercise process, we did not define CBR for respondents. Instead, in Round 1, we deliberately asked respondents to describe their CBR practice. The descriptions that we received set the context for understanding

the Delphi results. According to the descriptions provided, respondents' research practices involved an extensive range of types and intensity of collaboration with community partners/researchers. Specific methods also varied widely and included both qualitative and quantitative methods. For some respondents, CBR starts with community needs, and the research questions, methods and actions taken are defined by community members. For other respondents, research questions and methods originate from the researcher and there is no expectation that action will be taken on the findings.

Dichotomised Views

Some respondents acknowledged that addressing power relations was important but resisted the characterisation of such efforts as 'political'. For example, one participant stated:

The research itself need not be (perhaps, should not be) political or politically motivated...However, the issue of power relationships between researchers, community groups and community members is important and must be consciously and overtly addressed.

Others found descriptors such as 'anti-oppressive' and 'empowering' to be too negative and/or pathologising, preferring more positive framings, e.g. 'social justice'. The controversy around the political nature of CBR was well reflected in participants' narratives, particularly regard-

ing the adherence to Indigenous epistemologies and anti-racist, anti-oppressive, and anti-colonial or decolonising perspectives.

For some respondents, these overtly politicised perspectives were critical to their work. As one participant aptly noted:

With the dropping of the above VPs [related to these perspectives], academic researchers maintain their privileged ability to define, design, and implement...Ideally we should all be aiming to protect the most vulnerable and be committed to praxis that contributes to decolonizing and anti-oppressive methodologies and theoretical frameworks.

Through the process, we also heard a strong voice from a few respondents who repeatedly pointed out the relevance of Indigenous and anti-colonial frameworks to CBR. For example, one respondent stated in the second round:

I feel strongly that the values related to Indigenous and anti-colonial frameworks need to be included, otherwise we will continue to conduct research that is colonial and creates harm. I am not sure how many Indigenous communities or partners participated in the first round, but it might be important to offer this again if the N is low.

However, not all participants agreed that CBR is always conducted with marginalised groups or that all ways of knowing should be respected. For exam-

ple, as one participant suggested, 'Community collaborative research is not always about isms and oppression.'

These dichotomised views were also evident in the results of the survey. Indeed, as reflected in the narrative data, we can see a divergent perspective on the 'political' nature of CBR (Table 3). The two VP categories, 'Addressing power relations' and 'Transformation of fundamental structures', which were perceived by some respondents as 'political', were trimmed down significantly in terms of the number of itemised VPs and, in the latter case, removed entirely. As indicated above, many of the more overtly political itemised VPs did not reach a majority consensus in the first round of the survey; for instance, 'Problematizes systematic relations of power in the social construction of knowledge' (44 per cent), 'Based on an anti-oppression framework' (41 per cent) and 'Fundamentally challenges the structures of oppression' (54 per cent).

The question of whether 'action' is an objective of CBR also provoked disagreement (Table 4). While a number of respondents characterised their research as 'community-based participatory action research', others did not suggest any action after the research, if at all. Related to this question, participants also varied in their perspectives on whether CBR questioned the status quo. For example, one commented, 'Sometimes the status quo is not that bad.'

Values and Principles

A central purpose of this study was to generate a list of VPs that different stakeholders could use as a reference for research ethics applications, tenure and promotion reviews, and formal collaboration agreements (readers who would like to view the complete list of itemized VPs should contact the lead author). However, when formulating this study, we were reminded at the outset that CBR researchers have frequently perceived discrepancies between the research values that are important to them as individual researchers and the priorities of the university as an institutional collective. Therefore, in both Rounds 2 and 3 we asked respondents to rank the relevance and importance of VPs for both their own CBR practice and that of the university community. The discrepancy between individual and institutional research values is indeed reflected in our findings.

RELEVANCE OF ITEMISED VPS

As reflected in the list, respondents place great emphasis on a few key VPs that have been discussed in the literature, such as dialogue, togetherness, reciprocity, respect for local knowledge, accountability to the community, and the importance of iterative processes, to name a few. However, our findings also show that the respondents hold different perspectives in terms of the relevance of the VPs to their own CBR practice versus the practice of the university as an institution.

In Table 5, we summaries the number of itemized VPs relevant to both respondents.

Looking into each VP category, we notice that, with one exception, most itemized VPs within the categories that are perceived to be relevant to the institution are also on the top of the list for researchers' own CBR practice. For example, respondents placed significant emphasis on 'Accountability' for both their own CBR practice and the practice of the institutional community as a whole. Most researchers suggested that, in terms of their own practice, accountability was primarily to their community partners. The excepted item was 'Researchers are accountable to the university' in the category of 'Accountability'. While 74.4 per cent of respondents perceived this principle to be relevant or very relevant to the institution, it did not pass the cut-off point for respondents' own CBR practice. Several participants also emphasised that researchers were accountable to outside funders; as one stated, 'In the excitement to collaborate we sometimes forget who is the funder and it is the funder who ultimately pulls the strings.'

Although there are two VPs ('Equitable participation' and 'Self-determination') for which respondents indicated equal numbers of itemised VPs as relevant to both their research and that of the university as an institution, there are major differences in most categories.

The greatest differences were in the categories of 'Reciprocity' and 'Reflexivity'. Filtered by the cut-off point (67 per cent), 67 out of the 88 itemised VPs included in the survey were thought to be relevant or very relevant to respondents' own CBR practice and only 33 to the practice of the institution.

Importance of VP Categories

Many VPs inform CBR practice; however, not all bear the same importance. In Round 3 of the survey, we asked respondents to rank the perceived importance of the 11 VP categories to their own CBR practice and that of the institution. Comparing the percentage ranking of importance for almost all VP categories, respondents tended to assign a lower importance to the work of the institution than to their own work (Table 6). 'Collaboration/partnership' and 'Accountability' topped both lists, albeit in different order. To illustrate, one participant asserted: 'CBR respects diverse epistemologies and ontologies'; another stated, 'All who are actively involved in the research are accountable to each other and to an ethical research process'. The difference in perceived importance was greatest for 'Equitable participation', 'Empowerment' and 'Self-determination'. These differences may reflect many CBR researchers' uncertainty about the extent to which the university, as an institution, respects and supports their CBR work. As suggested by one respondent:

I believe as an organization [our university] is most interested in outcomes rather [than process]. This stems from the discourse about research (and other) excellence wherein funding dollars, prestige and numbers of publications still appear to be valued most highly.

Next, we present our reflections on the findings outlined above and suggest some implications for CBR researchers.

Our findings indicate that researchers engaging in CBR have diverse understandings of the nature of CBR. Despite this diversity, the findings show some consensus among respondents on VPs that are central to the practice of CBR. The final list of itemized VPs may fill a gap in the literature. Here, we highlight a few observations on the discrepancies we identified with respect to participants' perspectives on relationships, power and action for social change. We then interweave these observations with reflections on the Delphi research process, especially with regard to the political nature of CBR.

As shown in the literature, CBR is a value-driven research approach. However, while there was broad agreement on the importance of trust, respect, collaboration, partnership and dialogue across disciplines, each CBR researcher tended to adhere to different VPs.

Values and principles related to Indigeneity raised some concerns among participants. Research is viewed negatively by many members of Indigenous groups be-

cause it has been used as a tool of exploitation and colonialism (Smith 2012). Some researchers see CBR as a potential means of overcoming these issues and addressing past harms, but it is not possible to simply insert an Indigenous worldview into the dominant research paradigm, which is based on the belief that knowledge is an individual entity. Conversely, Indigenous paradigms arise from the fundamental belief that knowledge is relational and experiential (Wilson 2008). These ideas raise the question of what it means to take Indigenous worldviews seriously when some researchers do not see decolonization as a meaningful research objective. There was a sense among some respondents that anti-colonial frameworks and respect for Indigenous epistemologies were only relevant when Indigenous people were directly involved in the research. From a neocolonial perspective, this is problematic as we are all (settlers and Indigenous) negatively affected by colonial structures and, arguably, collectively share responsibility to address these structures in society.

Participants pointed to the importance of respecting diverse ontologies and epistemologies, but also emphasised that not all worldviews should be respected (e.g. Nazism). Still, most participants agreed that CBR is an 'ethical research practice'. Although 'ethical' was not defined precisely, such comments seem to imply that

not all research is or has been ethical, a point which is also made strongly in the literature (e.g. Smith 2012). The high ranking accorded collaboration/partnership in the survey is consistent with the major discussion in the literature, reflecting the nature of CBR as a collaborative project (Brydon-Miller & Maguire 2009; CAMH 2011; Elliott 2012). Indeed, this is the VP that was least contested. In other words, there was a lot of agreement on the means (collaboration) and less on the ends (e.g. decolonisation, production of new knowledge) of CBR, and also whether power relations should form a consideration. Questions were also raised about the nature of the relationship in terms of whether solidarity was a desirable element. It is somewhat surprising to us that many researchers who are engaged in collaborative partnerships with community partners resisted characterisation of their research as 'political', when equitable inclusion (which all respondents acknowledged as important) is an overtly political intervention that challenges university hierarchies of knowledge production (Stanton 2014). On the other hand, if CBR is being conducted with powerful groups who hold reprehensible worldviews, ensuring equitable inclusion may be problematic for researchers committed to both CBR and social justice.

While we are cognisant that the final list of VPs is a result of consensus based

on the majority rule, i.e. an artificial cut-off point, it has provided a common base from which CBR researchers can engage in dialogue among themselves as well as with their stakeholders, particularly the university administration. The following observations may be useful for CBR researchers who have to negotiate their work constantly with their affiliated institution. It is not uncommon to hear CBR researchers complain that their work is not treasured, particularly under the current neo-liberal managerial atmosphere of the academic setting.

First, in terms of importance, respondents proposed a similar ranking of the categorical VPs for both their own CBR practice and their expectation of their institutions. However, 67 VPs were considered to be relevant or very relevant to respondents' own CBR practice compared to 33 for the institution; among the 33 itemised VPs deemed relevant to the university community, eight (24 per cent) concern 'Accountability'. In other words, there is a perception that the institution is concerned most with accountability and publications and less with relationship building, which accords with the broader neoliberal context. CBR researchers, even those who resist the characterization of CBR as political, seem to want to insert ethical considerations into research processes, while the university is more concerned with measurable outcomes in terms of publications. Finally, principles

such as 'Values process and outcomes', 'Long-term relationships' and 'Reflexivity' seem to matter to respondents' own practice more than to that of the university as an institution. This may reflect respondents' perception of the administrative emphasis of the university as an institutional organization or a cynical attitude on the part of researchers who feel their research is not held in high regard by their institution. Indeed, it is this perceived lack of regard that lay behind the creation of the CBR initiative at the university in question.

The Politics of CBR

Questions of power are inherently political because, in broad terms, politics concerns the distribution of power and resources in society. Coming from social work, education and geography disciplinary backgrounds, we had understood CBR and indeed all research to be 'political'. However, some of the responses we received to the survey reveal that this is not the view of all CBR researchers. Here we explore the implications of respondents' differing perspectives on equality/equity, anti-oppression and objectivity.

It became evident early in the study that, when we tried to define CBR, many tensions emerged amongst faculty members in various disciplines, between those doing more quantitative research than qualitative research, and between faculty and community members and researchers and their institution. Interestingly, the

main tensions seemed to be rooted in the epistemological, ontological and axiological positions of the respondents, which were closely tied to their discipline and institutional context. This was further complicated by the reality that, despite our efforts as researchers to be as inclusive as possible through various recruitment methods, including institution-wide invitations, faculty-wide invitations and personal invitations, our participants were inevitably only partially representative of the faculty, staff and university community. The absence of many voices led us to question the ethical nature of the research that we were undertaking, especially when we read many of the comments on the study in Round 3 concerning the importance of respecting diverse epistemologies, addressing power imbalances and accountability to an 'ethical research process'.

Admittedly, the consensus-seeking nature of the Delphi approach might have further marginalized some political views held by CBR researchers from some disciplines and, as a result, in many 'political' VPs being eliminated. Most participants agreed that building equality or equity in relationships means addressing power explicitly; however, based on the 67 per cent cut-off, itemised VPs that included openly political terms such as power, anti-oppression, Indigenous and anti-colonial were dropped following the first round. In other words, at least

among the respondents to this study, most did not agree with the 'political' nature of CBR. However, some respondents in the second round expressed concerns with this result. We realised that we did not have the means, given that the consensus of the group determined the final list of VPs, to deeply address the many tensions and systemic inequities that seemed to mark the texts of the survey responses. Fortunately, some members of the study spoke up during our workshop after Round 1 and consensus was reached to reinstate several VPs that otherwise would have been eliminated from the final list, due mainly, in our view, to the absence of certain marginalised voices, disciplines and non-mainstream approaches to research in the survey process. This was due in part to systemic inequities and institutional absences. Removing the most overtly politicized VPs was perceived by some respondents to leave academic researchers in the privileged position that many scholars claim CBR is supposed to redress, and perhaps to undermine decolonial and anti-oppressive methodologies. In short, the tendency of the majority of respondents to opt for a relatively objective and apolitical position was viewed by others as masking what were fundamental issues of injustice which have significant impact on institutional practice of tenure, promotion and ethical approaches to CBR.

These findings raise many questions. What does it mean to suggest that CBR (or, indeed, any research) is non- or apolitical? What are the implications of resisting acknowledgement of the political nature of research? One of the critiques of objectivity in the literature is that it has been used to subordinate research subjects within specific projects as well as CBR researchers in the academy (Absolon & Willett 2005; Deloria 1997; Wells & Jones 2009). Is it possible or desirable to acknowledge one's positionality and simultaneously claim objectivity? Why do some researchers resist designating their research anti-oppressive or anti-colonial? What are the effects of this resistance for researchers, research participants, and CBR more broadly?

Building on the debate over the political nature of CBR, the question of whether positive social change was a meaningful research objective was also contested by participants. Although respondents agreed that CBR results should benefit all participants, there was less agreement on whether improving lives was a desirable or reasonable goal of CBR. It is interesting to note in this context that no itemised VP from the category of 'Empowerment' passed the cut-off point.

Related to these questions, for some researchers critiquing the (presumably inequitable) status quo was crucial to their practice, while others argued that the status quo was not always in need of

critique and that the goal of CBR should be discovery and knowledge creation. Yet, we wonder if CBR is simply aimed at the creation of new knowledge, how can researchers avoid reinscribing colonial relations or repeating the mistakes of past research that mined community members for their 'data' without improving their lives?

To be critical of power relationships implies the desire for change. We expected to see these concerns reflected in our findings. Although 'Action for positive social change' remained important for many participants, 'Transformation of fundamental structures' was removed after the first round. Once again, the more overtly political actions tended to be rejected. In other words, there was some agreement that action is an important principle of CBR, but much less agreement on the nature of the action, for example, whether the goal of action is to further decolonisation or something more mundane (e.g. publication of a report). This goes to the heart of the disagreement among participants: is CBR a political research approach aimed at action to improve lives, or is it an objective research approach that seeks to create new knowledge? Can it be both?

Implications for future research

Based on the findings and our related reflections, we propose the following additional questions about CBR may be worth exploring further:

What does 'political' mean in the context of CBR, and how political should CBR be?

As a research method, should CBR have a 'predetermined' outcome?

Does CBR require different forms of accountability compared to other methodologies?

Is 'action' an objective of CBR? What is the relationship between CBR, action and justice?

Is CBR only for marginalised/colonised groups? To what extent should CBR be informed by a particular discourse?

Is there any element that distinguishes CBR from other research approaches on which all CBR researchers could agree? Should CBR be defined?

To conclude, CBR is a growing research approach increasingly being adopted by researchers from diverse disciplines. While the findings reported here may fill a gap in the literature on which values and principles matter to CBR, they also raise additional questions for further exploration. The diverse perspectives on the political and action-oriented nature of CBR comprise an important issue that researchers and community members whose work comes under the CBR banner should address as more and more academic institutions begin to emphasise the importance of community-based research.

NOTE: Readers who would like to view the complete list of itemised VPs should contact the lead author.

References:

1. Center for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) 2011, Building equitable partnerships: Tools and lessons learned, CAMH, Toronto, ON.
2. Cochran, P, Marshall, C, Garcia-Downing, C, Kendall, E, Cook, D, McCubbin, L & Gover, R 2008, 'Indigenous ways of knowing: Implications for participatory research and community', *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 98, no. 1: pp. 22–27. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2006.093641
3. Cornwall, A 2008, 'Unpacking 'Participation': Models, meanings and practices', *Community Development Journal*, vol. 43, no. 3: pp. 269–83. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010>
4. Dalkey, N 1967, *Delphi*, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica.
5. Deloria Jr, V 1997, *Red earth white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*, Fulcrum Publishing, Golden, CO.
6. Elliott, P 2012, *Participatory action research: Challenges, complications, and opportunities*, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.
7. Fletcher, C 2003, 'Community-based participatory research relationships with aboriginal communities in Canada: An overview of context and process', *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal & Indigenous Community Health*, vol. 1, no. 1: pp. 27–62.
8. Flicker, S, Roche, B & Guta, A 2010, 'Peer research in action III: Ethical issues', *Community Based Research Working Paper Series*, The Wellesley Institute, Toronto, ON.
9. Flicker, S, Savan, B, Kolenda, B & Mildemberger, M 2008, 'A snapshot of community-based research in Canada: Who? What? Why? How?', *Health Education Research*, vol. 23, no. 1: pp. 106–14. doi: 10.1093/her/cym007
10. Freudenberg, N & Tsui, E 2014, 'Evidence, power, and policy change in community-based participatory research', *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 104, no. 1: pp. 11–14. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2013.301471
11. Geist, M 2010, 'Using the Delphi method to engage stakeholders: A comparison of two studies', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, vol. 33, no. 2: pp. 147–54. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.06.006
12. Hall, B 2009, 'Higher education, community engagement, and the public good: Building the future of continuing education in Canada', *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, vol. 35, no.1, pp. 11–23.

13. Haraway, D 1988, 'Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective', *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3: pp. 575–99. doi: 10.2307/3178066
14. Hasson, F, Keeney, S & McKenna, H 2000, 'Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 32, no. 4: pp. 1008–15. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.t01-1-01567.x>
15. Heffner, G, Zandee, G & Schwander, L 2003, 'Listening to community voices: Community-based research, a first step in partnership and outreach', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 8, no. 1: pp. 127–39.
16. Hernández, E 2015, 'What is "good" research? Revealing the paradigmatic tensions in quantitative criticalist work', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, vol. 2014, no. 163: pp. 93–101. doi: 10.1002/ir.20088
17. Horowitz, C, Robinson, M & Seifer, S 2009, 'Community-based participatory research from the margin to the mainstream', *Circulation*, vol. 11, no. 19: pp. 2633–42. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.729863
18. Israel, B, Schulz, A, Parker, E & Becker, A 2001, 'Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research', *Education for Health*, vol. 14, no. 2: pp. 182–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576280110051055>
19. Jacklin, K & Kinoshameg, P 2008, 'Developing a participatory aboriginal health research project: "Only if it's going to mean something"', *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, vol. 3, no. 2: pp. 53–67. doi: 10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.53
20. Jacobson, M & Rugeley, C 2007, 'Community-based participatory research: Group work for social justice and community change', *Social Work with Groups*, vol. 30, no. 4: pp. 21–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J009v30n04_03
21. Kirkness, V & Barnhardt, R 2001, 'First nations and higher education: The four R's – respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility', in R Hayoe & J Pan, *Knowledge across cultures: A contribution to dialogue among civilizations*, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
22. McAreavey, R & Muir, J 2011, 'Research ethics committees: Values and power in higher education', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol. 14, no. 5: pp. 391–405. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2011.565635>
23. Minkler, M 2004, 'Ethical challenges for the "outside" researcher in community-based participatory research', *Health Education & Behavior*, vol. 31, no. 6: pp. 684–97. doi: 10.1177/1090198104269566

24. Ochocka, J & Janzen, R 2014, 'Breathing life into theory: Illustrations of community-based research – hallmarks, functions and phases', *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 7, no. 1: pp. 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v7i1.3486>
25. Okoli, C & Pawlowski, S 2004, 'The Delphi method as a research tool: An example, design considerations and applications', *Information & Management*, vol. 42, no. 1: pp. 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002>
26. Ontario Women's Health Network (OWHN) 2009, *Inclusion research handbook*, OWHN, Toronto, ON.
27. Reid, C, Tom, A & Frisby, W 2006, 'Finding the "action" in feminist participatory action research', *Action Research*, vol. 4, no. 3: pp. 315–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750306066804>
28. Ross, L, Loup, A, Nelson, R, Botkin, J, Kost, R, Smith, G & Gehlert, S 2010, 'Human subjects protections in community-engaged research: A research ethics framework', *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, vol. 5, no. 1: pp. 5–17. doi: 10.1525/jer.2010.5.1.5